

A brief declaracion

4

of the Lordes Supper, written by
the syngular learned man, and most
constaunt Martir of Iesus Christ,
Nicholas Ridley Bishop of Lons-
don prisoner in Oxforde, a litel
before he suffred deathe for
the true testimonie of
Christ.

Roma.8.

For thy sake are we killed all daye
long, and are compted as shepe
appointed to be slayne.
Neuertheles in all
these thinges we o-
uercome through
him, that lo-
ued vs.

Anno. 1555.

To the Reader.

Vnderstande (good reader) that
this great clecke and blessed martir, bishop
Nicholas Ridley sought not (by setting
furthe this notable godly piece of learned worke)
the bayne glorie of the world, nor temporal frend-
ship of men for his present aduancement, muche
lesse he hunted hereby for Bishoprikes and bene-
fices, as all his aduersaries (the enemies of Chri-
stes truth and ordinaunce) the Papistes commonly
doo: but hauing consideration of the great charge
of soule committed vnto him, and of thacompte
therof which the iustice of God wolde require at
his handes, intending therewithall to be founde
blameles in the great daye of the Lorde, seeing he
was put aparte to defende the Gospel. he not on-
ly forsooke landes, goodes, world, frendes, and him-
selfe withall; and testified the truth specified in
this booke by his learned mouthe in the open pre-
sence of the worlde: but also (to leaue a sure mo-
nument and lone token vnto his flocke) he hath
regestered it by his owne penne in this forme en-
suyng, and sealed it vp with his blood. Forasmuch
than as he hath approued him selfe no bayne dis-
putour, no wethercocke, nor hipocrite, saying he
hath willingly genen his lyfe for the truth:
and inasmuche also as his loue and
most constaint christian conscience
speaketh frely vnto thee, gentill
reader: I beseeche thee for
Christes sake and thyne
owne, lende him thine
indifferent heart,
and patient
hearyng.

¶

MAny thynges confounde
a weake memoꝛie: a fewe
places well weighed and
perceaued, lyghten the vn-
derſtādyng. Truthe is ther to be ſear-
ched, wher it is certayne to be hade.
Though God dothe ſpeake the truthe
by man, yet in mannes woꝛde (which
God hath not reuealed to be his) a mā
may doubt, without myſtruſt in god.
Chriſt is the truthe of God reuealed
vnto man from heauen by God hym-
ſelfe, and therfoꝛe in his woꝛde the
truthe is to be founde, which is to be
embrace of al that be his. Chriſt bid-
deth vs aſke, & we ſhall haue: ſearche,
and we ſhall fynde: knocke, and it ſhal
be opened vnto vs. Therfoꝛe our hea-
uenly father, the autoꝛ and fountayne
of all truthe, the botomles ſea of al vn-
derſtāding, ſende downe (we beſeche
the) thy holy ſpirite in to our heartes,
and lyghten our vnderſtāding wyth
the beames of thy heauenly grace.

We aſke thee this (O merciful father)
not in reſpecte of our deſertes, but foꝛ
thy deare ſonne oure ſaueour Ieſus
Chriſtes ſake. Thou knoweſt (O hea-
uenly father) that the controuerſie a-

A 2 bout

*The. bleſſe
ſed mar-
tirs prayer*

Note.

bout the Sacrament of the blessed bo-
dye and blood of thy deare sonne, our
saueour Iesu Christ, hath troubled
not of late only, þ church of Englade,
Fraunce, Germanye, and Italie, but
also many yeares agoo. The fault is
ours (no doubt) therfore, for we haue
deserued thy plague. But (O Lorde)
be mercifull, and releue our myserie
with som light of grace. Thow know-
west (O Lorde) how this wicked world
rolleth vp and downe, and releteth to &
fro: and careth not what thy will is,
so it maye abyde in wealthe. If truthe
haue wealthe, who are so stowte to de-
fende the truthe, as they: But if Chri-
stes croffe be layed on truthe's backe,
than they banyshe awaye straight, as
ware before þ fire. But these are not
they (O heauenly father) for whom I
make my most moane, but for those
sely ones (O Lord) which haue a zeale
vnto thee: those I meane, which wold
and wishe to knowe thy will, and yet
are letted, holden backe, & blynded by
the subtilties of Satan and his Mi-
nisters, the wickednesse of this wret-
ched worde, and the synful lustes and
affectiones of the fleshe. Alas Lorde,
thow knowest that we be of our sel-
ues

nes but fleshe, wherin ther dwelleth
nothing that is good. How than is it
possible for mā without the (O Lorde)
to vnderstande thy truthe in dede?
Can the natural man perceave the
will of God? O Lorde, to whom thou
gauest a zeale of thee, geue them also
(we beseeche thee) þy knowlage of thy
blessed will. Suffre not the (O Lorde)
blyndlye to be ledde, for to stryue a-
gainst thee as thou diddest those (A-
las) which crucified thine owne sone:
for geue them (O Lorde) for thy deare
sonnes sake, for they knowe not
what they doo. They do thinke (Alas,
O Lorde) for lacke of knowlage, that
they doo vnto the good seruice, euen
whan agaynst thee they doo most ex-
tremely rage. Remembre, O Lorde
(we beseeche the) for whom thy mar-
tyr Stephan did praye, and whom
thyne holy Apostle Paule did so truly
and earnestly loue: that for their sal-
uacion, he wished hym self accursed
for them. Remembre (O heauenly fa-
ther) the prayer of thy deare sonne,
our saueour Chyste, vpon the crosse,
whan he sayd vnto thee: O father for-
geue them: they knowe not what they
doo. With this forgeuenesse, O good

Lozde, geue me (I beseeche the) thy gra-
ce, so here briezly to set furthe the say-
enges of thy sonne our saueour Iesu
Christ, of his Euāgelistes, and of his
apostles, that in this afozesaide cōtro-
uersie, the light of the truthe, by þ lan-
terne of thy worde maye shyne vnto
al them that loue the.

Of the Lozdes last supper do speake
expzessely the euāgelistes, Matthewe,
Marke, & Luke: but non moze playn-
lye noz moze fully declareth þ saine,
than dothe S. Paule, partly in the 10.
Chaptre, but especially in þ 11. Chap.
of his furst epistle to þ Corinthianes.
As Matthewe and Marke doo agree
muche in wordes, so do likewise Luke
and S. Paule. But al. iiii. no doubt, as
they were all taught in one schole, &
inspired w one spirite, so taught they
all one truthe. God graunt vs to vn-
derstande it well. Amen.

Matthewe setteth furthe Christes
supper thus.

Matth. 26

Whan euē was come, he sate downe w
the. xij. cc. As they did eate, Iesus toke
bread, and gaue thankes, brake it, and
gaue it to the disciples, and sayed. Take,
eate, This is my body. And he toke the
cuppe

cuppe, gaue thankes, gaue it to them
sayeng: Drynke ye al of this: for this is
my blood of the newe testament, that
is shedde for many, for the Remission
of synnes. I saye vnto you, I will not
drynke hencefurthe of this frute of the
vyne tree, vntil that daye, whan I shall
drynke that newe in my fathers king-
dome. And whā they hade sayed grace,
they went out. &c.

Now Marke speaketh it thus. And
as they ate, Iesus toke bread, blessed,
and brake, and gaue to them, and saied:
Take, eat, This is my body. And he
toke the cuppe, gaue thākes, and gaue it
to them, and they all dranke of it. And
he sayed vnto them: This is my blood
of the newe testament, which is shedde
for many. Verily I saye vnto you, I wil
drinke no more of the frute of the vyne,
vntil that daye, that I drinke that
newe, in the kingdome of God.

Here Matthewe and Marke do a-
gree not only in y^e mater, but also al-
most fully in the forme of wordes. In
Matthewe gaue thākes. Marke hathe
one worde, Blessed: which signifieth
in this place all one. And where Mat
A 4 thewe

Mar. 14.

thetwe sayeth : Drynke ye all of this :
Marke sayeth : they al dranke of it. And
wher Matthewe sayeth : of this frute
of þ vyne : Marke leaueth out þ worde
(this) and sayeth, of þ frute of the vyne .

Luce. 22. Now let vs see likewise , what a-
grement (in forme of wordes) is be-
twene S. Luke and S. Paule . Luke
wyrteth thus : He toke bread, gaue tha-
kes, brake it, and gaue it to them, sayēg :
This is my body which is geue for you
This doo in the remembraunce of me.
Likewise also whan they hade supped,
he toke the cuppe, sayeng : This cuppe is
the newe testament in my blood, which
is shedde for you.

1. Cor. 11. Saint Paule setteth furthe þ Lorde
des supper thus. The Lorde Jesus, the
same night , in the which he was be-
trayed, toke bread, and gaue thankes , &
brake, and sayed : Take, eate : this is my
body, which is broken for you. This doo
in remembraunce of me. After the same
maner he toke the cuppe , whan supper
was done, sayeng This cuppe is the
newe testament in my blood. This doo,
as often as ye shall drinke it , in the re-
membraunce of me. For as often as ye shall
eate this bread, & drinke this cuppe , ye
shall

shal shewe y^e Lordes death, vntil he come

Here wher Luke sayeth, which is geuen: Paule sayeth, which is broken. And as Luke addeth to the wordes of Paule spoken of the cuppe (which is shedde for you) so likewise Paule addeth to the wordes therof, This doo, as often as you shall drinke it in the remembraunce of me. The rest that foloweth in S. Paule bothe ther and in 10. chap. pertyneth vnto the right vse and doctrine of the Lordes supper,

Thus the Euangelistes & S. Paule haue rehearsed the wordes & worke of Christ, wherby he did institute & ordayne this holy sacramēt of his body & blood, to be a perpetuall remēbraūce vnto his cōmyng again of him self (I saie) y^e is of his body geuē for vs, & of his blood shedde for y^e remission of synnes. But this remēbraunce which is thus ordayned, as y^e autor therof is Christ (bothe God and man) so by the almightie power of God, it farre passeth all kyndes of remembraunces, that any other man is able to make eyther of hym selfe or of any other thing. For who so euer receaueth this holy Sacramēt thus ordayned in remēbraūce of Christ, he receaueth ther

with either deathe or life. In this (I
trust) we doo all agree. For S. Paule
sayeth of þe godly receauours in y. 10.
chap. of his furst epistle vnto the Co-
rinthiās: The cuppe of blessing, which
we blesse, is it not the partaking or felo-
weship of Chrestes blood? And also he
sayeth. The bread which we breake (&
meaneth at the Lordes table) is it not
the partaking or feloweship of Chrestes
bodye? Now the partaking of Chrestes
body and of his blood vnto the faith-
full and godly, is the partaking or fe-
loweship of life & immortalitie. And a-
gayn of the badde and vngodly recea-
uours, S. Paule as playnly sayeth
thus: He that eateth of this bread, and
drynketh of this cuppe vnworthily : is
giltie of the body and blood of þe Lorde.
How necessary thā it is, if we loue
life, & wolde eschue deathe, to trye and
examine our selues, before we eate of
this bread, and drynke of this cuppe:
for elles assuredly, he that eateth and
drynketh therof vnworthily, eateth &
drynketh his owne damnacion, bicau-
se he esteemeth not the Lordes body: þe
is, he reuerenceth not the Lordes bo-
dy wth þe honour that is due vnto him.

And that which was sayd, that wth
the

Note.

the recept of the holy Sacrament of
the blessed body and blood of Christ is
receaued of euery one, good & badde,
either life or deathe, it is not mēt, that
they which are dead befoze God, maie
hereby receaue life: or the lyuing be-
foze God can hereby receaue deathe.
For as non is mete to receaue natu-
ral fode, wherby y natural life is nou-
rished, except he be borne & liue befoze:
so no man cā fede (by the recept of this
holy sacrament) of the fode of eternal
life, except he be regenerated & borne
of God befoze. And on the other syde,
no man here receaueth damnacion
which is not dead befoze.

Thus hitherto without all doubt,
God is my witnesse, I saye so farre as
I doo knowe, ther is no controuer-
sie among them that be learned, in
the churche of Englande (concerning
the mater of this sacrament) but all
doo agree, whether they be newe or
olde: and to speake playne, and as som
of them doo odiously call either other:
whether they be protestauntes, papi-
stes, pharisees, or gospellers. And as
al doo agree hitherto, in y aforesayed
doctrine, so al do deteste, abhorre & cō-
dēne y wicked heresie of y Messalomas
nes

*Right Honourable
of Borne in Germany*

nes, which other wise be called Eutiches, which said, y^e h^{oly} Sacramēt cā nother do good nor harme. Al do al so cōdēne those wicked Anabaptistes, which put no difference betwene the Lordes table and the lordes meate, & their owne. And bicause charitie wolde, that we should, (if it be possible, and so farre as we maye with the sauegarde of good cōscience, & mayntenaunce of the truthe) agree with all men: therfore me thinkes, it is not charitably done to burthen any man (either newe or olde, as they cal them) further, than such doo declare them selues, to dissent from that we are perswaded to be truthe, or pretende therto to be controuersies, wher as non suche are in dede: and so to multiplie the debate, the which the more it dothe encrease, the further it dothe departe from the vnitie, that the true christian should desyre.

And agayn, this is true, that truthe nother nedeth nor wilbe maynteyned with lies. It is also a true proverbe, that it is euen synne, to lye vpon the deuil: for though by thy lye thou doest synne neuer so muche to speake agaynst the deuil, yet in p^{er} thou lyest,

iii

*what it is
to lye.*

in dede thow woꝛkest the deuilles
woꝛke:thow doest him seruice, and
takest the deuilles parte. Now whe-
ther than they doo godly and charita-
bly, which either by their pen in wri-
ting, oꝛ by their woꝛdes in pꝛeaching,
doo beare the symple people in haꝛde,
that those which thus doo teache & be-
leue, doo goo about to make the holy
Sacrament(oꝛdayned by Chꝛist him
self)a thing no better than a piece of
common bꝛead:oꝛ that doo saye, that
suche doo make the holy Sacrament
of the blessed body and blood of Chꝛist
nothing elles, but a bare signe or a
figure, to represent Chꝛist non other-
wise, than the Flue bushe dothe re-
present the wyne in a tauerne, oꝛ as a
vile persone goꝛgiouſlye apparailled,
maye represent a kyng oꝛ a pꝛince in
a playe. Alas let men leaue lyeng,
and speake the truthe euery one, not
only to his neighbour, but also of his
neighbour:for we are membres one
of an other, sayeth saint Paule. The
controuerſie(no doubt)which at this
daye troubleth the churche (wherin
any meane learned man, either olde
or newe, dothe stande in)is not, whe-
ther the holy Sacrament of the body
and

*The flau-
derous lies
of the pas-
pist.*

and blood of Christ, is no better than
a piece of comō bread or no: or whe-
ther the Lordes table is no more to be
regarded, thā the table of any earthy
man or no: or whether it is but a bare
signe or figure of Christ and nothing
elles or no. For all doo graunt, that
S. Paules wordes doo require, that
the bread which we breake, is the par-
taking of the body of Christ, and also
doo graunt hym that eateth of that
bread, or drinketh of y cuppe vnwoz-
thily, to be gilty of the Lordes death,
and to eate and drinke his owne
damnacion, bicause he esteemeth not
the Lordes body. All doo graunt, that
these wordes of S. Paule (whan he
sayeth: If we eate, it auantageth vs no-
thing: or if we eate not we want nothig
therby) are not spoken of the Lordes
table, but of other common meates.

wherin
the contro-
uersy con-
sisteth.

Thus thā hitherto yet, we al agree.
But now let vs see, wherin the dissen-
sio dothe stande. The vnderstanding of
it, wherin it chiefly stādeth, is a steppe
to the true searching furthe of the
truth. For who can seke well a reme-
die, if he knowe not before, y disease?
It is nother to be denyed nor dissem-
bled, that in the mater of this Sacra-
ment

mēt ther be diuerse poyntes, wherfor
men (counted to be learned) can not
agree. As whether ther be any Trans
substantiation of the bread, or no: any
corporal & carnall presence of Chzistes
substaunce, or no: Whether adozacion
(due onlpe vnto God) is to be done
vnto the Sacrament or no: and whe
ther Chzistes bodye be ther offred in
dede vnto þ heauēly father, by þ priest
or no: and whether þ euil man receas
ueth the naturall bodye of Chzist or
no. yet neuerthelesse as in a man dise
eased in dyuerse partes, commonlpe
the originall cause of suche diuerse
diseases, which is spredde abzoade
in the body, doo come from one chese
meimbre, as from the stomacke, or
from the head: euen so all fyue afore
sayed doo chiefly heng vpon this one
question: which is, what is the mater
of the Sacrament: whether is it the
naturall substaunce of bread, for the
natural substaunce of Chzistes owne
body: The truthe of this questiō truly
tryed out and agreed vpon, no doubt
shal cease the cōtrouerfie in al þ rest.
For if it be Chzistes owne natural
body, bozne of the virgine: than assu
redly (seing that all learned men in
England

Englande so farre as I knowe, bothe
newe & olde, graunt there to be but one
substaunce) than I saye, they must ne-
des graunt Transubstanciacion: that
is, a chaunge of y^e substaunce of bread,
into the substaunce of Christs bodye.
Thā also they must nedes graunt the
carnall and coꝝporal presence of Chri-
stes bodye. Than must the Sacramēt
be adored with y^e honour due to Christ
him selfe, for the vnitie of the two na-
tures in one persone. Than yf y^e priest
do offre the Sacrament, he dothe offre
in dede Christ him selfe. And finally
the murtherour, the aduouterour, or
wicked mā receauing the Sacramēt,
must nedes than receaue also the na-
tural substaunce of Christs owne bles-
sed bodye, bothe fleshe and blood.

Nowe on y^e other syde, yf after the
truthe shalbe truly tryed out, it shalbe
founde, that the substaunce of bread is
the naturall substaunce of the Sacra-
ment, although for the chaunge of the
vse, office and dignitie of y^e bread, the
bread in dede sacramentally is chaun-
ged into the bodye of Christ, as the wa-
ter in Baptisme is sacramētally chaū-
ged into the fountayne of regenerati-
on, & yet the natural substaunce ther-
of

of remaineth all one, as was before :
yf (I say) the true solucion of that for-
mer question (wherupon al these con-
trouersies do heng) be, that the natu-
rall substance of bread, is the mate-
rial substance in the Sacrament of
Christes blessed body: than must it ne-
des folowe, of the former proposition
(confessed of all that be named to be
learned, so farre as I do knowe, in
Englande) which is, that ther is but
one material substance in the Sacra-
ment of the bodye, and one only lyke-
wise in the Sacrament of the bloode:
that ther is no suche thing in dede and
in truthe, as they call Transubstanci-
acion: for the substance of bread re-
mayneth stil in the Sacrament of the
bodye: than also the natural substance
of Christes humane nature, which he
toke of the virgine Mary is in heauē,
where it reigneth nowe in glorie, and
not here inclosed vnder the forme of
bread: than that godly honour, which
is only due vnto God & creatour, may
not be done vnto the creature without
idolatrie and sacrilege, is not to be
done vnto the holy Sacrament.

Than also the wicked, I meane the
impenitēt murderour, aduouterour,

or suche like, do not receaue the natural substance of y^e blessed body & blood of Christ. Finally thā dothe it folowe, y^e Christes blessed body & blood, which was once only offered & shedde vpon the crosse, being auailable for the sinnes of al the hole worlde, is offered vp no more, in the natural substance therof, nother by y^e priest nor any other thing. But here before we go any further to searche in this mater, & to wade (as it were) to search & trye out (as we may) y^e truthe hereof in the scripture, it shall do wel by the way, to knowe, whether they that thus make answer & solution vnto the former principal questioⁿ, do take awaye simplie and absolutly the presence of Christes body & blood, from the Sacrament ordained by Christ, and duely ministred according to his holy ordinance and institutioⁿ of the same. Undoubtedly they doo denye that vtterlye, either so to saye, or so to meane. Hereof yf any man do or will doubt, the bookes which are writtē already in this mater of them, that thus doo answer, will make the mater playne.

Now than wil you say, what kynd of presence do they graunt, & what do they

they deny: Briefly they denie the pre-
sence of Christes body in the naturall
substaunce of his humane & assume
nature, and graunt the presence of the
same by grace: that is, they affirme
and saye, that the substaunce of the na-
turall body and blood of Christ is on-
lye remainyng in heaue, and so shal-
be vnto the later daye, whan he shall
come agayne in glorie (accompanied
with the Angelles of heauen) to iudge
bothe the quicke and the deade. And
that the same natural substaunce of the
very body & blood of Christ, bycause
it is vnited vnto the diuine nature in
Christ & secōde person of the Trinitie.
Therefore it hath not onlye lyfe in it
selfe, but is also hable to geue & dothe
geue lyfe vnto so many as be or shal-
be partakers therof: that is, & to all &
do beleue on his name, which are not
borne of blood (as S. Io. sayeth) or of
& wil of & fleshe, or of & wil of mā, but
are borne of God: though the selfe sa-
me substaunce abyde still in heauen,
and they for the tyme of their pilgri-
mage dwel here vpon earth: By gra-
ce (I saye) that is, by the gyfte of
thys lyfe (mencioned in Iohn) and the
properties of the same, mete for our

pilgrimage here vpon earth, the same
bodie of Christ is here present with vs.
Euen as for example, we saye, & same
Sunne which (in substance) neuer re-
moueth his place out of the heauens,
is yet present here by his beames,
light, and naturall influence, where it
shyneth vpon the earthe. For Goddes
worde and his Sacramentes be (as it
were) the beames of Christ, which is
Sol iusticie, the Sūne of ryghteousnes.

Thus haste thou hearde, of what
sorte or secte so euer thou be, wherin
dothe stande the principall state and
chiefe point of all the controuersies,
which do ppeely pertyne vnto the na-
ture of this Sacramēt. As for the vse
therof, I graunt ther be many other
things, wherof here I haue spoken
nothyng at all. And now least thou in-
stly mightest complayne, and say, that
I haue in opening of this mater done
nothyng elles, but digged a pitte, and
haue not shut it vp again: or broken a
gap, & haue not made it vp agayne: or
opened & boke, & haue not closed it a-
gayne: or elles to cal me what thou li-
kest, as neutrall, dissembler, or what
so euer elles thy lust & learnyng shall
serue to thee to name me worse.

There

Therefore here now I wil (by Goddes
grace) not only shortly but so cleare-
ly & playnly as I cā make h̄ to know,
whether of ȳ aforesaid two answeres
to ȳ former principal state & chief poīnt
dothe lyke me best: yea and also I wil
holde al those accursed, which in this
mater (ȳ now so troubleth ȳ churche
of Christ) haue of God receaued the
kepe of knowlage, & yet goo about to
shutte vp ȳ doores so, ȳ they thē selues
wil not entre in, nor suffre other that
wolde. And as for myne owne parte,
I cōsydre, bothe of late what charge &
cure of soule hath ben cōmitted vnto
me, wherof God knoweth, howe
sone I shalbe called to geue accōpte: &
also now in this worlde, what perill &
daūger of ȳ lawes (cōcernyng my life)
I am now in at this p̄sēt tyme. What
folye where it thā for me, now to dis-
seble w̄ God, of whō assuredly I loke &
hope by Christ to haue everlastīg life.
Seing ȳ suche charge & daūger (bothe
before God & mā) doo compasse me in
roude about on euery syde: therfore
(God willing) I will frankely & frely
bittre my mynde, & though my body
be captiue, yet my tōgue & my pen (as
long as I maye) shall frely set furthe,

that which vndoubtedly I am persua-
ded to be y^e truthe of Goddes worde.
And yet I wil do it vnder this protesta-
cion, call me protestaunt who iusteth.
I passe not therof. My protestacion
shalbe thus: that my mynde is & ever
shalbe (God willing) to set furthe syn-
cerely the true sense and meanyng (to
the best of my vnderstanding) of God-
des most holy worde, & not to decline
from the same, either for feare of
worldly daunger, or elles for hope of
gayne

I doo proteste also due obedience &
submission of my iudgement in this
my wryting, and in all other myne af-
faires vnto those of Christes church,
which be truly learned in Goddes ho-
ly worde, gathered in Christes name,
and guided by his spirite. After this
protestacion, I doo playnly affirme
and saye, y^e the seconde answer made
vnto the chief question and principal
poynt, I am persuaded to be the very
true meanyng and sense of Goddes
holy worde: that is, that the naturall
substaunce of bread and wyne is the
true material substaunce of the holy
sacrament of the blessed body & blood
of our sauour Christ: and the places
of

*Answer to
the chief
question*

of scripture, wherupon this my faith
is grounded, be these, bothe concerning
þ sacramēt of þ body, & also of þ blood.

First let vs repete the begynnyng
of the institucio of the Lodes supper,
wherin al þ thre euāgelistes, and S.
Paule almost in wordes doo agree,
sayeng that Iesus toke bread, gaue tha
kes, brake, and gaue it to the disciples,
sayeng. Take, eate, this is my body.
Here it appeareth playnly, that Christ
calleth very bread, his body. For that
which he toke, was very bread. In
this all mē doo agree. And that which
he toke, after he hade geuen thanks,
he brake: and that which he toke and
brake, he gaue to his disciples: & that
which he toke, brake, and gaue to his
disciples, he sayed hym self of it: This
is my bodye. So it appeareth playnly,
that Christ called very bread his body.
But very breade cā not be his body in
very substaūce therof: therefore it must
nedes haue an other meanīg. Which
meanynge appeareth playnly what it
is, by the next sentence that foloweth
immediatlye, bothe in Luke & in Paule.
And þ is this: Doo this in remēbraūce
of me.

Wherupon it semeth unto

Argument

me to be euident, that Chzist did take
bread, & called it his bodye, for that he
wolde therby institute a perpetual re-
membraunce of his body: specially of
singular benefite of our redempcion,
which he wolde than procure and
purchase vnto vs, by his body vpon
the crosse. But bread reternyng still
his owne very natural substaunce,
maye be thus by grace, (and in a sa-
cramental significatiō) his body: wher
as elles the very bread which he toke,
brake, and gaue them, could not be in
any wise his natural body. For that
were confusion of substaunces, and
therfore the very wordes of Chzist
ioyned with the next sentence follo-
wing, bothe enforceth vs to confesse
the very bread, to remayne still, and
also openeth vnto vs, how that bread
may be and is thus by his diuine po-
wer his body, which was geue for vs.
But here I remembre, I haue red in
some writours of the contrarie opi-
nion, which doo denye that, & which
Chzist did take, he brake. For (saye
they) after his taking, he blessed it, as
Marke doth speake. And by his bles-
sing, he chaunged the natural sub-
staunce of the breade in to the natu-
ral

ral substance of his bodye: and so although he toke the bread, and blessed it, yet because in blessing he chaunged the substance of it, he brake not the bread, which than was not ther, but only the forme therof.

Unto this objection I haue two playne answers, bothe grounde vpon Goddes worde. The one I will here rehearse: the other answer I will deferre, vntil I speake of the Sacramēt of the blood. Myne answer here is take out of y^e plaine wordes of S. Paul, which dothe manifestlye confounde this fantastical inuencion, first inuēted (I wene) of Pope Innocentius, & after confirmed by the subtile sophister Duns, and lately renewed nowe in our dayes, with an eloquent stile & muche finesse of wytte. But what can craftye inuencion, subtiltie in sophismes, eloquence or fynesse of wytte preuaile against the vnfalible worde of God? What nede we to striae and contend what thing we breake, for Paul sayeth, speaking vndoubtedly of the Lordes table: The bread (sayeth he) which we breake, is it not the partaking or feloweship of the Lordes bodye? Whereupon it foloweth, that after the

A 5 than-

Mar.
Antho.
conf.
Gardiner.

Ad. 2. 20.

thakes geuyng it is bread which we
breake. And how ofte in the Actes of þ
apostles, is the Lordes supper signifi-
ed by breaking of bread: They did per-
seuer (sayeth S. Luke) in the Apostles
doctrin, cōmunion, & breakig of bread.
And they brake bread in euery house.
And again i an other place, whā they
were come together to break bread &c.
I. Paul which setteth furth most fully
in his wytyng bothe the doctrine & þ
right vse of þ Lordes supper, & þ sacra-
mētall eating & drinking of Chzistes bo-
dy & blood, calleth it fyue times bread,
bread, bread, bread, bread.

The. 2.
reason,

The sacramental bread is the my-
sticall body, and so it is called in scrip-
ture 1. Cor. 10. as it is called the natu-
ral body of Chzist. But Chzistes mysti-
cal body is the congregacion of chzisti-
anes. Now nomā was euer so sonde,
as to saye, that that sacramētall bread
is transubstanciatiō and chaunged in
to the substance of the congregatiō.
Wherefore no man should likewise
thinke, or saye, y þ bread is trāsubstā-
ciated & chaūged in to þ natural sub-
stance of Chzistes humayne nature.

But my mynde is not here to wyte
what maye be gathered out of scriptu

res

res for this purpose ; but only to note here briefly , those which seme vnto me, to be the most playne places. Therefore contented to haue spoken thus muche of the sacramental bread, I will now speake a litel of y^e Lordes cuppe.

The. 3.
Argument.

And this shalbe my thrid argumēt grounded vpon Christes owne wordes. The natural substaunce of the sacramental wyne remayneth still, and is y^e material substaunce of the sacrament of y^e blood of Christ: Therefore it is like wise so in y^e Sacramental bread.

I know that he that is of a contrary opinion, wil denye the former parte of myne Argument. But I wil proue it thus, by the playne wordes of Christ him self , bothe in Mathewe and in Marke. Christes wordes are these: after the wordes said vpon the cup. I saie vnto you (saith Christ) I wil not drinke hencefurthe of this frute of the vyne tree, vntil I shall drinke that newe in my fathers kingdome. Here note how Christ calleth playnlie his cuppe the frute of the vyne tree. But the frute of the vyne tree is very natural wyne. Wherefore the natural substaunce of the wyne dothe remayne still in the Sacrament of Christes blood.

And

And here in speaking of þe Lordes cup,
it cometh vnto my remembraunce þe
vanitie of Innocentius his ſataltical
inuenccion, which by Paules wordes
I did confute befoze, & here did pro=
mise ſomwhat moze to ſpeake, & that
is this. If the tranſubſtanciacion be
made by this worde (Blessed) in
Marke ſayed vpon the bread, as In=
nocentius that pope did ſaye: Than ſu=
rely ſeing that worde is not ſayed of
Chriſt, nother in any of the euangeli=
ſtes noꝝ in S. Paule vpon the cuppe:
Ther is no tranſubſtanciacion of the
wyne at al. For wher the cauſe dothe
faile, ther can not folowe the effecte.
But the ſacramental bread & the ſacra=
mental wyne doo bothe remayne in
their natural ſubſtaunce alike, and if
the one be not chaunged, as of the ſa=
cramental wyne it appeareth euident=
ly: than ther is no ſuch tranſubſtanci=
acion in nother of them bothe,

The papiſ=
tes affirme
they wotte
not what

All that put & affirme this chaunge
of þe ſubſtaunce of bread & wyne in to
the ſubſtaunce of Chriſtes bode and
blood (called Tranſubſtanciacion) doo
alſo ſay this chaunge to be made by a
certain forme of preſcripte wordes
and non other. But what they be that
make

make the chaunge, either of the one
 or of the other, vndoubtedly enē they
 that doo write most fynely in these
 our dayes, almost confesse playnlye,
 that they can not tell. For although
 they graunt, to certayn of the olde au-
 to:rs, as Crysoftome and Ambrose: that
 these wordes (This is my body) are the
 wordes of consecracion of the sacra-
 ment of the body: yet saye they, these
 wordes maye well be so called, bicause
 they doo assure vs of the consecracion
 therof, whether it be done befoze these
 wordes be spoken or no.

But as for this their doubt (con-
 cerning the sacrament of the bodye)
 I let it passe. Let vs now considze the
 wordes which perteyne to the cuppe.
 This is furst euident, y as Matthewe
 muche agreeth w Marke, & likewise
 Luke with Paule, much agreeth herin
 in forme of wordes: so in the same, the
 forme of wordes in Matthewe and
 Marke is diuerse frō that which is in
 Luke & Paule: y olde auto:rs doo most
 rehearse y forme of wordes in Mat-
 thewe & Marke: bicause I wene they
 semed to thē most cleare. But here I
 wold knowe, whether it is credible or
 no, that Luke and Paule, whan they
 celebra

Gardiner
 to the 48.
 obiection

First
 in the rebuto of
 Luther

*Petre and
Paule had
no such
priesthode
as the pa-
pistes haue*

celebrated the Lordes supper wth their
congregaciones, that they did not vse
the same forme of wordes (at the Lordes
table) which they wrote, Luke in
his gospel, and Paule in his epistle.
Of Luke, bicause he was a phisicion,
whether some will graunt, that he
might be a priest or no, and was ha-
ble to receaue \hat{y} ordre of priestthoode,
which (they say) is geuen by vertue
of these wordes sayed by the bishop:
Take thou autoritie to sacrifice for the
quycke and the dead. I can not tell,
but if they shoulde be so strapt vpon
Luke, either for his crafte, or elles for
lacke of suche power geuen him by
vertue of thasore said wordes: than I
wene, bothe Petre and Paule are in
daungier to be deposed of their priest-
thoode, for the crafte either of fyshing,
which was Petres: or making of
tētes which was Paules, were more
hile, than the science of phisike.
And as for those sacramental wordes
of the ordre of Priestthoode to haue
autoritie to sacrifice bothe for \hat{y} quyk
and the dead, I wene Petre & Paule
(yf they were bothe alyue) were not
hable to prone, that euer Christ gaue
them such autoritie, or euer saied any
such

saue woordes vnto them. But I will
let Luke goo, and bicause Paule spea-
keth more for hym self, I will rehear-
se his woordes: That (sayeth Paule)
which I receaued of the Lorde I gaue
vnto you. For the Lorde Iesus, &c. And
so he setteth furth the hole institucioe &
right vse of the Lordes supper. Now
seing that Paule here sayeth, that
which he receaued of the Lorde, he
hade geuen them, and that which he
hath receaued and geuen them befoze
by worde of mouthe, now he rehear-
seth & wryteth the same in his epistle:
is it credible that Paule wolde neuer
vse this forme of woordes, vpon the
Lordes cuppe, which (as he sayeth) he
receaued of the Lorde, that he hade ge-
uen them befoze, and now rehearseth
in his Epistle? I trust no man is so
farre from all reaso, but he wil graunt
me, that this is not likely so to be.
Now than if you graunt me, that
Paule did vse the forme of woordes,
which he wryteth: Let vs than rehe-
arse and conside Paules woordes,
which he sayeth, Christ spake thus vpon
h cup. This cup is the new testamēt
in my blood: this do as often as ye shal
dunke it, in the remembraunce of me.

Here

Here I wold knowe, whether that
Christes wordes spokē vpon the cuppe,
were not as mightye in worke, and
as effectuell in significacion to all in-
tentes, constructions and purposes
(as our Parliamēt men doo speake)
as they were spoken vpon the bread.
If this be graunted, which thing I
thinke no man can denye: than fur-
ther I reaso thus. But the worde (is)
in the wordes spoken vpon the Lordes
bread dothe mightily signifie (saye
they) the chaunge of the substance of
that which goeth before it, in to y^e sub-
stance of y^e which foloweth after, y^e is,
of the substance of bread in to the
substance of Christes bodye, whan
Christ sayeth: This is my bodye. Now
than if Christes wordes which are
spoken vpon the cuppe, which Paule
here rehearseth be of the same might
and power, bothe in working and sig-
nifieng: Than must this worde (is)
whan Christ sayeth: This cuppe is the
newe testament &c. turne the substance
of the cuppe in to the substance of
the newe testament. And if thou wilt
saye, that this worde (is) nother ma-
keth nor signifieth any suche chaunge
of the cuppe, although it be saide of
Christ,

Christ, that this cuppe is the newe test-
tament, yet Christ ment no suche
chaunge, as that. Mary Sir, even so
saye I, whā Christ sayde of the bread,
which he toke, and after thanks ge-
uen brake and gaue them, sayeng:
Take, eate, this is my body, he ment
no more any suche chaunge of the
substaunce of bread in to the substaunce
of his naturall bodye, than he ment of
the chaunge and Transubstanciacion
of the cuppe in to the substaunce of
the newe testament. And if thou wilt
saye, that the worde (cuppe) here in
Christes wordes dothe not signifie
the cuppe it self, but the wyne, or thig
conteyned in the cuppe, by a figure
called *Metonymia*, for y Christes wor-
des ment, and so must nedes be take:
thou sayest very well. But I praye
the by the waye, here note two thin-
ges. First that this worde (is) hath
no suche streynight or significacion in
the Lordes wordes, to make or to sig-
nifie any transubstanciacion. Secōd-
ly, that the Lordes wordes wherby he
instituted the sacramēt of his blood,
he bleth a figuratyue speache. How
bayne than is it, that some so earnest-
ly doo saye, as it were an infallible
C rule

Note
well the
Papistes
errorr con-
futed.

rule, that in doctrine & in the instituti-
on of the sacramentes, Christ vbled no
figures, but all his wordes are to be
strayned to their propre significaciōs:
whā as here what so euer thou sayest
was in y cuppe, nother y noz the cup it
selfe (taking euery worde in his pro-
pre significaciō) was y new testamēt,
but in vnderstanding that which was
in the cuppe, by the cuppe y is a figura-
tiue sprache: yea & also thou cannest
not verifie oz truly saye of that, whe-
ther thou sayest it was wyne oz Chri-
stes blood, to be the newe testament
without a figure also. Thus in one sen-
tence spoken of Christ, in the institu-
tion of the sacrament of his blood, the
figure must helpe vs twyse. So vn-
true is it, that some doo wyte, that
Christ vbleth no figure in the doctrine
of faythe, noz in the institucion of his
Sacramentes. But some saye, yf we
shal thus admytte figures in doctrine,
than shal all the articles of our fayth,
by figures and allegories shortly be
transformed and vnlosed. I saye it is
lyke fault (& euē the same) to deny y fi-
gure, where y place so requireth to be
vnderstanden, as baynely to make it
a figuratiue sprache, which is to be vn-
der-

derstāden in his propre signification.

The rules wherby þe speche is known, whan it is figuratiue, & wherby it is none, S. Augustine in his booke *De doctrina christiana*, geueth diuerse learned lessons, very necessarie to be known of þe studentes in Goddes worde. Of the which, one I will rehearse which is thys. If (sayeth he) the scripture dothe seme to commaūde a thing, which is wicked or vngodlye: or to forbidde a thing that charitie dothe require, than knowe thou (sayeth he) that the speche is figuratiue. And for exāple he bringeth the sayeng of Christ, in þe 6. chap. of S. Ioh. Except ye eate the fleshe of the sone of mā, & drinke his blood, ye can not haue lyfe in yon: it semeth to commaūde a wicked or an vngodly thing. Wherfore it is a figuratiue speche, commaūding to haue cōmuniō & felowship w̄ Christes passiō, & deuoutly & holsomlye to laye vp in memorie, that his fleshe was crucified and wounded for vs.

And here I can not but maruel at some men, surely of muche excellēt synesse of wyt, & of great eloquēce, that are not ashamed to wyte & say, þe this aforesaid sayeng of Christ is after S. Austīn a figuratiue speche in dede:

C 2

howe

Aug. De
Doc. chri
stiana. li.
3. ca. 16.

Gardiner
in his ans
wers to the
161. G. 226
obiection.
Note,

howbeit not vnto the learned, but to
the vnlearned. Here let any man that
but indifferently vnderstandeth the
latine tongue, read the place in S.
Austen: & if he perceauē not clearly S.
Augustines wordes & mynde to be cō-
trary, let me abyde therof the rebuke.

This lēssō of S. Augustine I haue
therfore the rather set furthe, bicause
it teacheth vs to vnderstāde that place
in Iohn figuratyuely. Euen so sure-
ly the same lesson with the example
of S. Augustines expoliciones therof,
teacheth vs not only by the same, to
vnderstande Christes wordes in the
institucion of the Sacrament bothe
of his body and of his blood figuraty-
uely, but also the very true meanyng
and vnderstanding of the same. For
if to commaunde to eate the fleshe of
the sonne of man, and to drinke his
blood semeth to commaunde an in-
conueniēce and an vngōdlyneste, and
is euen so in dede, if it be vnderstāde
as the wordes doo stāde in their pro-
pre significacion: and therfore must
be vnderstanden figuratyuely & spiri-
tually, as S. Augustine dothe godly
and learnedly interpretē them: Than
surely Christ commaunding in his
last

last supper to eate his body, and to
drinke his blood, seemed to commaunde
in sounde of wordes, as great and
euen the same inconuenience and vn-
godlinesse, as did his wordes in the 6.
chap. of S. Iohn: and therfore must
euen by the same reason, be lykewise
vnderstanden and expounded figura-
tynely & spirituallly, as S. Augustine
did the other: Wherunto that exposi-
cion of S. Augustine may seme to be
the more mete, for that Christ in his
supper, to the commaundement of ea-
ting and drinking of his body & blood
addeth, Doo this in the remembraunce
of me. Which wordes surely were the
keye, that opened & reuealed the spiri-
tuall and godly exposition vnto S.
Augustine.

But I haue taried longer in set-
ting furthe & forme of Christes wor-
des vpon the Lordes cuppe, written
by Paule and Luke, than I did intēde
to do. And yet in speaking of the forme
of Christes wordes, spoken vpon his
cuppe, cometh now to my remembraunce
the forme of wordes vsed in the latine
masse, vpon the Lordes cuppe. Wher-
of I doo not a litell maruaile, what
shoulde be the cause seing the latine

*The Lordes
cuppe,
as the prie-
stes say.*

Masse agreeth with the euangelistes
and Paule, in the forme of wordes
sayed vpon the bread: why in the wor-
des sayed vpon the Lordes cuppe, it
diffreth from them all, yea and addeth
to the wordes of Christ spoken vpon
the cuppe, these wordes, *Mysterium fidei*,
that is, the mysterie of faith, which ar
not redde to be attributed vnto the sa-
crament of Christs blood, nother in
the euangelistes nor in Paule, nor so
farre as I knowe, in any other place
of holy scripture: yea and if it maye
haue som good exposition, yet why it
should not be aswell added vnto the
wordes of Christ vpon his breade, as
vpon his cuppe, surely I doo not see
h mysterie. And bicause I see in the vse
of the latine masse the sacrament of h
blood abused, whan it is denyed vnto
the laye people, cleane contrary vnto
Goddess most certain worde: for why,
I doo beseeche the, should the sacramēt
of Christs blood be denyed vnto the
lay christiā, more thā to p priest? Did
not Christ sheade his blood aswell for
h laye godly mā, as for h godly priest?
If thou wilt saye, yea that he did so.

But

But yet þ̄ sacramēt of the blood is not
to be receaued without the offering vp
& sacrificeing therof vnto God the fa-
ther, bothe for the quicke and for the
dead: and no man maye make oblaci-
on of Christes blood vnto God, but a
priest, and therfore the priest alone (&
that but in his Masse only) maye re-
ceue the sacrament of the blood. And
call you this (Maisters) *Mysterium fidei*?
Alas alas, I feare me this is before
God *Mysterium iniquitatis*, the misterie of
iniquitie, suche as S. Paule speaketh
of, in his epistle to the Thessalonians.
The Lorde be mercifull vnto vs, and
blesse vs, lighten his countenance
vpon vs, and be mercifull vnto vs.
That we may knowe thy waye vpon
earthe, and among all people thy sal-
uation.

2. Thess. 2.
Prayer.
Psal. 67.

This kynde of oblacion standeth
vpon Transubstanciacion his cousyn
germayne, and they doo growe bothe
vpō one groude. The lord wede it out
of his vineyard shortly (if it be his bles-
sed wil & pleasure) þ̄ bitter roote. To
speake of this oblaciō, how muche is
it iniurious vnto Christes passion?

The masse
sacrifice
iniurious
to Christi-
ans passio

Hebr. 9.
30.

Gardiner
in the an-
swer to
the. 15. ob-
jection.

How it can not, but with highe blas-
phemye and haynous arrogauuncie,
& intolerable pryde, be claimed of any
man, other than of Christ hym self:
how much and how playnly it repug-
neth vnto the manifest wordes, the
true sense and meaning of holy scrip-
ture in many places, especially in the
epistle to the Hebrues: the mater is so
long, and other haue written in it
at large, that my mynde is nowe,
not to intreate therof any further.
For onely in this my scribling, I
intende to search out and set furth by
the scriptures (according to Goddes
gracious giste of my pooze know-
lage) whether the true sense and mea-
ning of Christes wordes in þe institucio
of his holy supper, do requyre any
Trāsubstāciatio, as they cal it: or that
the very substaūce of bread and wyne
doo remayne still in the Lordes sup-
per and be the material substaūce
of the holy Sacrament of Christ our
saueours blessed body and blood. yet
ther remayneth one wayne Quidditie of
Duns in this mater, þe which bicause
some that write now doo seme to like
it so well, that they haue strypped him
out of Dunces dustye and darke ter-
mes

mes, and pricked hym and paynted
hym in freshe colours of an eloquent
stile: & may therfore deceaue the moze,
except the errour be warely eschued.

Suns sayeth in these wordes of
Christ, This is my body, this pro=
nowne demonstratyue, meanyng the
woꝛde (this) if ye will knowe, what it
dothe shewe oꝛ demonstrate, whether
þ bꝛead that Christ toke oꝛ no: he an=
swereth no, but only one thing in
substaunce it poynteth, wherof the
nature oꝛ name it dothe not tell, but
leaueth that to be determyned and
tolde by that which foloweth þ woꝛde
(is) that is by *Predicatum*, as the logici=
an dothe speake: and therfore he cal=
leth this pronowne demonstratiue
(This) *Indiuiduum Vagum*, that is, a wā=
dꝛing propre name, wherby we maye
poynt out and shewe any one thing
in substaunce, what thing so euer it
be. That this ymaginacion is bayne
and vntuly applyed vnto these woꝛ=
des of Christ, This is my body: it may
appeare plainly in þ woꝛdes of Luke
and Paule, sayed vpon the cuppe, co=
ferred with þ forme of woꝛdes spokē
vpō þ cuppe in Matthewe and Marke.
foꝛ as vpō the bꝛead it is sayed of al.

¶ This

This is my body: so of Mattheue and Marke it is sayed of the cuppe, This is my blood. Than if in the wordes, This is my body, the worde (this) be (as Duns calleth it) a wādring name, to appoynt and shewe furthe any one thing, wherof the name and nature it dothe not tell: so must it be likewise in those wordes of Mattheue and Marke vpon the Lordes cuppe, This is my blood. But in the wordes of Mattheue and Marke, it signifieth and poynteth out y^e same, that it dothe in the Lordes wordes vpon the cuppe in Luke and Paule, wher it is sayd This cuppe is the newe testament in my blood. &c. Therfore in Mattheue & Marke the pnowne demonstratyue (this) dothe not wandre to poynt only one thing in substaunce, not shewing what it is, but telleth it plainlie what it is, no lesse in Mattheue and Marke vnto the eie, than is done in Luke and Paule, by puttig to this worde (cuppe) bothe vnto the eie, and vnto the eare. For taking the cuppe and demonstrating or shewing it vnto his disciples, by this pnowne demonstratine (this) and sayeng vnto them, Drinke ye all of this: it was than al one to say. This is

is my blood, as to saye: This cuppe is
my blood, meanyng by the cuppe as
the nature of the speche dothe require,
the thing conteyned in the cuppe. So
likewise without all doubt, when
Christ had taken bread, geuen than-
kes, and broken it, and geuing it
to his disciples sayed, Take: and so de-
monstrating and shewing that bread
which he had in his handes, to saye
than, This is my body: & to haue said,
This bread is my body. As it were all
one, if a man lacking a knyfe, & goig
to his oysters, wold say vnto an other,
whō he sawe to haue two kniues, Sir,
I praye you lende me the one of your
knyues. Were it not now all one to
answer hym, Sir, holde I will lende
you this to eate your meate, but not
to open oysters withall: and holde, I
will lende you this knyfe to eate
your meat, but not to open oysters.
This similitude serueth but for this
purpose, to declare y nature of speche
withall, wher as the thing that is de-
monstrated and shewed, is evidently
perceaued, and openly knowen to the
eye. But O good Lord, what a won-
derfull thing is it to see, how some mē
doo labour to teache, what is demon-
strated

Card. to
the. 13. ob-
jection.

God ma-
kers agree
not among
them (ch. 6.)

strated and shewed by the pronowne
demonstratyue, this, in Chyistes woꝝ-
des whan he sayeth: This is my body:
This is my blood: how they labour (I
saye) to teache, what that (this) was
than in dede, whā Chyist spake in the
begynnyng of the sentence the woꝝde
(this) before he hade pronounced the
rest of the woꝝdes, that folowed in the
same sentence: so that their doctrine
maye agree with their Transubstan-
ciacion: which in dede is the very fou-
dacion, wherin al their erroneous doc-
trine dothe stande. And here the Tran-
substantiatours doo not agree amōg
them selues, no moze than they doo in
the woꝝdes which wrought the Tran-
substantiacion, whan Chyist did furst
institute his Sacrament: Wherin In-
nocentius a bishop of Rome of the later
dayes, and Duns (as was noted be-
foze) doo attribute the woꝝke vnto the
woꝝde (Benedixit) Blessed: but the rest
foꝝ the most parte, to Hoc est corpus meum,
This is my body. &c. Duns therfoze wth
his secte, bicause he putteth the chaūge
befoze, must nedes saye, y (this) whan
Chyist spake it in the begynnyng of
the sentence, was in dede Chyistes bo-
dy. Foꝝ in the chaunge, the substance
of

of bread did departe, and the change
was now done in *Benedixit* (sayeth
he) that went before: and therfore af-
ter hym and his, that (this) was than
in dede Chyistes body, though þ word
did not importe so much, but only one
thing in substaunce: which substaun-
ce after Duns (the bread being gone)
must nedes be the substaunce of Chyis-
tes body. But they that put their Trā
substantiation to be wrought by the-
se wordes of Chyist, This is my body:
and doe saye, that whan the hole sen-
tence was finished, than this chaūge
was perfected, and not before: they cā
not saye, but yet Chyistes (this) in the
begynnyng of the sentence before the
other wordes were fully pronounced,
was bread in dede. But as yet þ chan-
ge was not done, & so long the bread
must nedes remayne, and so long to
the vniuersal cōsent of al transubstaū-
tiators, the naturall substaunce of
Chyistes body can not come: and ther-
fore must their (this) of necessity demō-
strate & shewe the substaunce, which
was as yet in the pronouūceing of the
furst worde (this) by Chyist, but bread.
But how can they make and verifie
Chyistes wordes to be true, demon-
stra-

strating the substance which in the demonstration is but bread, and saye therof, This is my body: y^e is (as they saye) the natural substance of Christes body: except they wold saye, that y^e verbe (is) signifieth is made, or is chaunged in to. And so thā if the same verbe (is) be of y^e same effecte in Christes wordes spoken vpon the cuppe, and rehearsed by Luke & Paule: the cuppe or the wyne in the cuppe must be made or turned in to the newe testamēt, as was declared before.

*Garāner
a Neutral
or Iacke
of bothe
Sydes.*

There be som among the Transubstanciators, which walke so wpylye and so warely betwene these two aforesaid opinionones, allowyng them bothe, and holding playnly nother of them bothe, that me thynkes, they may be called Neutalles, Ambodexters, or rather suche as can shifte on bothe sydes. They plaie on bothe partes. For with the later, they do allowe the doctrine of the last sillable, which is that transubstanciacion is done by myracle in an instant, at y^e sounde of the last sillable (*um*) in this sentence, *Hoc est corpus meum*. And they doo allowe also Duns his fantastical imaginaciō of *Individuum vagum*, that demonstrateth
as he

as he teacheth, in Chyistes wordes,
one thing in substaunce, than being
(after his mynde) the substaunce of
the body of Chyist.

A maruailous thing, how any mā
can agree with bothe these two, they
being so cōtrarie the one to the other.
For the one sayeth, the worde (this)
demonstrateth the substaunce of bread:
and the other sayeth, no not so, the
bread is gone, and it demonstrateth
a substaunce which is Chyistes body.

Thus he sayeth this thrid man, ye
vnderstāde nothing at al. They agree
wel ynough in the chief poynt, which
is the grounde of al: that is, bothe do
agree and beare witnesse, that ther
is transubstanciacion. They do agree
in dede in that conclusion: I graunt.
But their processe and doctrine therof
do euē aswel agree together, as did y
false witnesse before Annas and Cai-
phas against Chyist: or the two wicked
iudges against Susāna. For against
Chyist the false witnesses did agre no
doubt, to speake all against hym. And
the wicked iudges were bothe agreed
to condemne poore Susanna: but in
examinacion of their witnesses, they
dissentēd so farre, that all was founde
false

*Gard. to
the. 84. ob
iection*

*Godma-
kers agree
against the
truth.
Note*

The cons-
sent of the
olde an-
tors,

false, & they went about, both & whet
in they agreed, & also those thinges,
which they brought for their proues.

Thus muche haue I spoken, in
searching out a solucion for this prin-
cipal questio, which was, what is the
material substance of the holy Sa-
crament, in the Lordes supper. Now
least I shoulde seme to set by myne
owne conceate, more than is mete: or
lesse to regarde the doctrine of the olde
ecclesiastical wyrtours, than is conue-
nient for a man of my pooze learning
and simple wytte for to doo. And bi-
cause also I am in dede perswaded, &
the olde ecclesiasticall wyrtours vn-
derstode the true meanyng of Christ
in this mater: and haue bothe so truly
and so playnly set it furthe in certayn
places of their wyrtinges, that no mā
which will vouchesafe to reade them,
and without preiudice of a corrupte
iudgement wil indifferently weighe
the, & construe their myndes non other
wise, than they declare them selues to
haue ment: I am perswaded (I saye)
that in reading of them thus, no man
can be ignoraunt in this mater, but
he that will shutte vp his owne eies,
and blyndfelde hym selfe. Whan I
speake

speake of ecclesiastical wrytours, I
meane of such, as were befoze the
wicked usurpaciō of the sea of Rome
was growē so vnmeasurably great,
that not only with tyrannical power,
but also with corrupte doctrine, it be-
ganne to subuerte Christes gospel, &
to turne the state, that Christ & his a-
postles set in h church, vpside downe.

For the causes aforesaid, I wil
rehearse certayn of their sayenges:
and yet bicause I take them but for
wytneses and expōiders of this doc-
trine, and not as the autors of the
same: and also for that now I wil not
be tedious, I will rehearse but fewe,
y is thzee olde wrytours of the Breke
churche, and other thzee of the Latine
churche, which doo seme vnto me, to
be in this mater most playne.

The Breke autors are Origene,
Chrysostome, and Theodoret. The La-
tyne are, Tertulliane, S. Augustine
and Gelasius. I knowe ther can be
nothing spoken so playnly, but y cras-
tye witte furnished with eloquence,
can darken it, and wrasse it quite fro
y true meaning to a cōtrary sēse. And
I knowe also, y eloquēce, cras-
te, and synesse of wytte hath gone about to
D bleare

bleare mennes eies , & to stoppe their
eares in thaforenamed wrytours, that
men should nother heare nor see, what
those autours both wryte and teache so
playnlye , that except men shoulde be
made bothe starke blynde and deafe,
they can not but of necessitie , yf they
will reade, and weye them indifferēt-
ly, bothe heare and see , what they doo
meane, whan eloquēce, crafte, and fy-
nesse of wytte haue done all that they
can. Nowe let vs heare the olde wry-
tours of the Breke church.

Origene.

*Eccl. Hist.
Li. 6, ca. 3*

Origene, which lyued about. 1250.
yeares agoo: a man for the excellencie
of his learning so hyghly esteemed in
Christes church, that he was cōpted &
iudged þ singular teacher in his tyme
of Christes religiō, the cōfōuder of he-
resies, the scholemaster of many god-
ly maters , & an opener of the hyghe
mysteries in scripture. He wryting by
on the. 15. chap. of S. Matthewes gos-
pel, sayeth thus: But yf any thing entre
into the mōuthe, it goeth away into the
bely, & is auoided into the draught. Yea
& that meate which is sanctified by the
worde of God & prayer, concerning the
mater therof, it goeth away into the be-
lye, & is auoyded into the draught. But
for þ praier which is added vnto it, for þ

proportion of the faith, it is made profitable, making the mynde hable to perceive and see that which is profitable. For it is not the material substance of bread, but the worde which is spoken vpon it, that is profitable to y man that eateth it not vnworthely. And this I meane of the typical & symbolical (that is, sacramental) bodye. Thus farre go the wordes of Origene, where it is playne, first that Origene speaking here of the sacramēt of the Lordes supper, as the last wordes do plainly signifie, dothe meane & teache, that the material substance therof is receaued, digested, & auoyded, as the material substance of other bread & meates is, which could not be, if ther were no material substance of bread at all, as the fantastical opiniō of trāsubstāciaciō dothe put. It is a worlde to see y answer of y papistes to this place of Origene. In y disputaciōs which were in this mater in the Parliament house, and in bothe the vniuersities of Cambridge and Oxforde, they that defended trāsubstāciaciō sayd, that this parte of Origene was but set furth of late by Erasmus, and therfore is to be suspected. But howe bayne this their

D 2

answer

The papistes objection against Origene.

An other
obiection.

answer is, it appeareth playnly. For
so may al the good olde autoz, which
laye in olde libzaries, & are set furthe
of late, be by this reason reiecte, as
*Clemēs Alexandrinus, Theodoretus, Iustinus, Ec-
clesiastica historia Nicephori, & other suche.*
An other answer they hade, sayeng
that Origine is noted to haue erred
in som pointes, and therfore saithe is
not to be geuen in this mater vnto
hym. But this answer well weighed
dothe minisre good mater to þe cleare
confutation of it self. For in dede we
graunt, that in som poyntes Origene
did erre. But those errours are gathe-
red out and noted both of S. Jerome,
and Epiphanius, so that his workes
(those errours excepted) are now so
muche the moze of autoritie, y^e suche
great learned men toke paynes to
draue out of hym, what so euer they
thought in him to be written amysse.
But as concerning this mater of the
Lordes supper, nother they nor yet e-
uer any other auncient autoz did euer
saye, that Origene did erre.

Gard. to
the: 166.

Nowe bicause these two answeres
haue ben of late so confuted and con-
founded, that it is wel perceaued, that
they will take no place: therfore some
which

which haue written sence that tyme,
haue forged twoo other answerres,
euen of the same molde. The former
wherof is, that Origene in this place
spake not of the sacrament of bread or
wyne of the Lordes table, but of an o-
ther mystical meate: of the which S.
Augustine maketh mencion to be ge-
uen vnto them, that were taught the
faith, befoze they were baptised. But
Origenes owne wordes in .ij. senten-
ces befoze rehearsed, being put toge-
ther, proue this answer vnttrue. For
he sayeth, that he meaneth of that fi-
guratiue and mystical body, which p-
fiteth them, that doo receaue it wor-
thily, alluding so playnlye vnto S. Pau-
les wordes spoken of the Lordes sup-
per: that it is a shame for any learned
man ones to open his mouthe to the
contrary. And that breade which S.
Augustine speaketh of, he ca not proue
that any such thing was vled in Ori-
genes tyme. yea & though that could
be proued, yet was ther neuer bread
in any tyme called a sacramental bo-
dy, sauing the sacramental bread of
the Lordes table, which is called of O-
rigene the typical and symbolical bo-
dye of Christ.

D;

The

*Gard. in
the same
place.*

The seconde of the two newe fōūde
answeres, is yet most monstrous of al
other, which is this. But let vs graūt
(saye they) that Origen spake of y^e Loz
des supper, and by the mater therof
was vnderstanded the material sub-
staunce of bread & wyne: what thā, say
they: for though y^e material substaunce
was once gone, & departed by reason
of Transubstanciacion, whiles the for-
mes of the bread and the wyne did re-
mayne, yet now it is no inconueniēce
to saye, that as the material substaunce
did departe at the entring in of Chri-
stes body vnder thaforsayd formes:
so whan the sayd formes be destroyed
and do not remayne, than cometh a-
gayn the substaunce of bread & wyne.
And this say they, is very mete in this
mysterie, that that which beganne wth
the miracle, shall ende in a myracle.
yf I hade not redde this fantasie, I
wolde scarcely haue beleued, that any
learned mā euer wolde haue set furth
suche a foolish fantasie: which not
onlye lacketh all grounde, either of
Goddcs worde, reason, or of any aun-
cient wrytour, but is also cleane con-
trarie to the common rules of schole
diuinitie: which is, that no miracle is
to

to be affirmed and put without necessity. And althoughe for their former miracle, which is their Transubstantiatio, they haue some colour, though it be but bayne, sayeng, it is done by the power and vertue of these wordes of Christ, This is my bodye: yet to make this seconde miracle of returnyng the materiall substaunce agayne, they haue no colour at all. Or elles I pray them shewe me, by what wordes of Christ is y^e seconde myracle wrought. Thus ye maye see, that the sleighes and shiftes which craft and witte can inuente to wasste the true sense of Origene, can not take place. But nowe let vs heare one other place of Origene, and so we wyll let him go.

Origene in the.ii. Homilie Super *Leuiticum*, sayeth, that ther is also even in the foure Gospelles, and not onlye in the olde Testament, a lettre (meanynge a literall sense) which fylleth. For yf thou folowe (sayeth he) y^e lettre in that sayeng: Except ye eate the fleshe of the sonne of man, & drinke his blood. &c. This lettre dothe kill. yf in that place the lettre dothe kil, wherin is comaunded the eating of Christes fleshe: than surelye in those wordes of Christe,

D 4 where

wherin Chzist comaundeth vs to eate
his body, the literal sense therof like=
wise dothe kill. For it is no lesse crime
but euen the same and all one in the
literal sense, to eate Chzistes bodye, &
to eate Chzistes fleshe. Wherefore if the
one doo kil, except it be vnderstanden
figuratiuely and spiritually: than the
other surely dothe kill likewise. But
that to eate Chzistes fleshe dothe kil so
vnderstanden, Origene affirmeth
playnly in his wordes aboue rehear=
sed: Wherefore it can not be iustly de=
nyed, but to eate Chzistes body literal=
ly vnderstanden, must nedes (after
hym) kill likewise.

The answer that is made to this
place of Origen of the papistes, is so
folishe, that it bewrapeth it self, with=
out any further confutation. It is the
same, that they make to a place of S.
Augustine, in his booke *De doctrina Chris=
tiana*: Wher as Saint Augustine spea=
keth in effecte y same thing that Ori=
gene dothe here. The papistes answer
is this: To y carnal mā y literal sense
is hurtful, but not so to the spiritual.
As thsugh to vnderstande that in his
propre sense, which ought to be taken
figuratiuely, were to the carnall man
a dayn

Li. 3. ca.

16.

a dangerous perile : but to the spiri-
tual man non at all.

Now to Chrysostome, whom I
bring for the seconde wrytour in the
greke church. He speaking agaynst
vnholy vsing of mānes body, which
after S. Paule ought to be kept pure
and holy, as the very tēple of the holy
goost, sayeth thus: If it be a fault (say-
eth he) to translate the holyed vesselles,
in the which is coneyned not the true
body of Christ, but the mysterie of the
body, to priuate vses: how much more
offence is it to abuse and defile the ves-
selles of our body?

Chrysost.

*In opere
imperfecto
ho. ii. in
Matth.*

These be the wordes of Chrysos-
tome. But I trowe that here many
fowle shiftes are deuised, to defeate
this place. The autoz (sayeth one) is
suspected. I answer. But in this place
neuer fault was founde with hym, vn-
to these our dayes. And whether this
autoz was Iohn Chrysostome him self
the Archebishop of Constantinopole,
or no: that is not the mater. For of all
it is graunted, that he was a wrytour
of that age, and a man of great lear-
nyng: so that it is manifest, that this
which he wryteth, was the receaued
opinio of learned men in his dayes.

*Cardi. to
the 198.
objection.*

Or elles vndoubtedly in suche a
mater, his sayeng shoulde haue be im-
pugned of som y wrote in his tyme,
or nere vnto the same. Nape (sayeth
an other) if this salucio will not serue,
we maye saye, that Chrysostome did
not speake of the vessels of the Loz-
des cuppe, or such as were than vled
at the Lozdes table, but of the vessels
vled in the temple in the olde lawe.
This answer will serue no more than
the other. For here Chrysostome spra-
keth of suche vessels, wherin was y
which was called the body of Christ,
although it was not y true body (say-
eth he) of Christ, but the mystery of
Christes bodye. Now of the vessels of
the olde lawe, the wrytours doo vse no
suche maner of phrase: for their sacri-
fices were not called Christes bodye.
For than Christ was not but in sha-
dowes and figures, and not by the Sa-
crament of his body reuealed. Eras-
mus which was a mā that coulde vn-
derstande the wordes and sense of the
wrytour, although he wolde not be
sene to speake agaynst this errour of
transubstanciacion, bicause he durst
not: yet in his tyme declareth playnely
that this sayeng of this wrytour is
non

non otherwise to be vnderstanden.

yet can I (sayeth the thirde papist) *Gard.in*
fynde out a fyne & subtil solution for the same
this place, & graunt all that yet is say- place
ed, bothe allowing here the wyrtour, &
also that he ment of the vessels of the
Lordes table. For (sayeth he) the body
of Christ is not conteyned in them, at
the Lordes table, as in a place, but as
in a mysterie. Is not this a pretie
shifte, and a mystical solution? But by
the same solution than, Christs body
is not in the Lordes table, nor in the
priesstes handes, nor in the pyre, and
so is he here no where. For they will
not say, that he is either here or ther,
as in a place. This answer pleaseth so
well the maker, that he hym self (af-
ter he had played with it a litel while,
and shewed the fynesse of his wytte &
eloquence therin) is content to geue it
ouer & say: but it is not to be thought,
that Chrysostome wolde speake after
this fynesse or subtiltie: and therfore
he returneth agayn vnto the seconde
answer for his shoote Ancoz, which
is sufficiētly confuted before. An other
shorte place of Chrysostome I will re-
hearse, which (if any indifferēcy maye
be

God. to
the 201. ob
jection,

be hearde) in playne termes setteth
furth the truth of this mater. Before þ
bread (saith Chrysostome *Ad Cesariū Mo
nachū*) be halowed, we cal it bread, but þ
grace of God sanctifieng it by the mea
nes of the priest, it is deliuered now fro
the name of bread, and estemerh worthy
to be called Christes body, although the
nature of bread tarye in it still. These
be Chrysostomes woꝝdes: wherin I
praye you, what can be sayed oꝝ
thought moze playne against this er
roure of transubstanciatiō, than to de
clare, that the bread abydeh so still.
And yet to this so playn a place, som
are not ashamed thus shamefully to
elude it, sayeng: we graunt, þ nature
of bread remayneth still thus, foꝝ that
it maye be sene, felt, and tasted: and
yet the corporal substance of þ bread
therfoze is gone, least two bodies
should be coniused together, & Christe
should be thought impanate.

What contrarietie and falshhead is
in this answer, the symple man maie
easily perceauē. Is not this a playne
contrarietie, to graunt that the natur
of bread remayneth so still, þ it maye
be sene, felt, and tasted: & yet to saye,
the corporal substance is gone, to ac
uide

woide absurditie of Christes impana-
cion: And what manifest falshead is
this, to saye or meane, that if the bread
should remayne still, than must solo-
we the inconuenience of impanacio:
As though the very bread could not
be a sacrament of Christes body (as
water is of baptisme) except Christ
should bryte the nature of bread to
his nature, in vnitie of persone, and
make of the bread, God.

Now let vs heare Theodoretus,
which is the last of the thre Breke au- *Theodore*
tors. He wryteth in his dialoge *Contra*
Eutichen thus. He that calleth his natu-
ral body, corne, and bread: and also na-
med hym self a vyne tree: euen he the
same hath honoured the Symboles
(that is the sacramental signes) with *Dial. 2*
the names of his body and blood, not
chaungeing in dede the nature it self,
but adding grace vnto the nature.

What can be more playnly sayed,
than this, that this olde wrytour say-
eth: that although the Sacramentes
beare the name of the body and blood
of Christ, yet is not their nature chaū-
ged, but abydeth stil. And wher is thā
the papistes transubstantiacion?

The same wrytour in h secōde dia-
loge

Ed. 10
the 201. ob
jection,

be hearde) in playne termes setteth
furth the truth of this mater. Before þ
bread (saith Chrysostome *Ad Cesariū Mo
nachū*) be halowed, we cal it bread, but þ
grace of God sanctifieng it by the mea-
nes of the priest, it is deliuered now frō
the name of bread, and esteemeth worthy
to be called Christes body, although the
nature of bread tarye in it still. These
be Chrysostomes wordes: wherin I
praye you, what can be sayed or
thought moze playne against this er-
rour of transubstanciatiō, than to de-
clare, that the bread abydeth so still:
And yet to this so playn a place, som
are not ashamed thus shamefully to
elude it, sayeng: we graunt, þ nature
of bread remaineth still thus, for that
it maye be sene, felt, and tasted: and
yet the corporal substance of þ bread
therfore is gone, least two bodies
should be confused together, & Christe
should be thought impanate.

What contrarietie and falshood is
in this answer, the symple man maie
easily perceauē. Is not this a playne
contrarietie, to graunt that the natur
of bread remaineth so still, þ it maye
be sene, felt, and tasted: & yet to saye,
the corporal substance is gone, to ac-
uide

woide absurditie of Christes impana-
cion: And what manifest falshead is
this, to saye or meane, that if the bread
should remayne still, than must solo-
we the inconuenience of impanaciō:
As though the very bread could not
be a sacrament of Christes body (as
water is of baptisme) except Christ
should bryte the nature of bread to
his nature, in vnitie of persone, and
make of the bread, God.

Now let vs heare Theodoretus,
which is the last of the thre Breke au- *Theodore*
tors. He wryteth in his dialoge *Contra*
Eutichen thus. He that calleth his natu-
ral body, corne, and bread: and also na-
med hym self a vyne tree: euen he the
same hath honoured the Symboles
(that is the sacramental signes) with *Dial. 2*
the names of his body and blood, not
chaungeing in dede the nature it self,
but adding grace vnto the nature.

What can be more playnly sayed,
than this, that this olde wrytour say-
eth: that although the Sacramentes
beare the name of the body and blood
of Christ, yet is not their nature chaū-
ged, but abydeth stil. And wher is thā
the papistes transubstantiacion?

The same wrytour in y^e secōde dia-
loge

to ge of þ same worke against thafore
said heretike Eutiches, wytteth yet
more playnly agaynst this error of
transubstanciacion, if any thing can
be sayed to be more playne. For he
maketh the heretike to speake thus
against hym that defendeth the true
doctrine, whom he calleth *Orthodoxus*.

As the sacramentes of the body
and blood of our Lorde are one thing
before the innocacion, and after the in-
uocaciō they be changed, and are made
an other: so likewise the Lordes body
(saythe the heretike) is after the assūp-
cion or ascension in to heauen, turned
in to the substance of God: the heretike
meaning therby, that Christ after his
assension, remayneth no more a mā.
To this *Orthodoxus* answereth thus,
& sayeth to þ heretike; Thou art taken
(sayeth he) in thyne owne snare. For
those mystical symboles or sacramētes
after the sanctificacion doo not goo out
of their owne nature, but they tarye and
abyde still in their substaunce, figure
and shape, yea & are sensibly sene & gro-
ped to be þ same they were before .&c.

At these wordes the papistes doo
startle: and to save the truthe, these
wordes be so playne, so ful, & so cleare
that

that they can not tell, what to saye,
but yet they will not ceasse to goo a-
bout to playe the cattles, and to cast
their colours ouer them, that the tru-
the, which is so plainly tole, should not
haue place. This autor wrote (saye
they) before the determination of the
churche. As who wold saye, what so
euer that wicked man *Innocentius* the
Pope of Rome determined in his con-
gregations with his monkes and
friars, that must be (for so *Dun* sayeth)
holden for an article and of the sub-
staunce of our faith. Some do charge
this autor that he was suspected to be
a Nestorian, which thing in Calcedon
counsaill was tried and proued to be
falle. But the fowlest shifte of all, and
yet the best that they can finde in this
mater, whan none other will serue:
is to saye, that Theodoroete vnderstan-
deth by the worde (substaunce) accidē-
tes and not substaunce in dede. This
glose is like a glose of a lawer vpon a
decree, y^e text wherof beginneth thus:
Statuimus, that is, We decree. The
glosse of the lawer ther (after many
other prety shiftes ther set furthe)
which he thinketh will not well
serue to his purpose, and therfore at
the

D. More
man in the
conuocacie
on house.

Distinc. ca
4. Statuimus.

the last to cleare the mater, he sayeth thus after y mynde of one lawer. *Vel Dic* (sayeth he) *Statuimus*, id est, abrogamus, þ is: or exposite we do decree, that is, we abrogate or disanull. Is not this a goodly and worthy glose? who will not say, but he is worthy in the lawe, to be reseynd of counsaill, that can glose so wel, and fynde in a mater of difficultie, such fyne shiftes? And yet this is the lawe, or at least the glose of the lawe. And therfore who can tell, what perille a man maye incurre to speake against it, except he were a lawer in dede, which can kepe him self out of the bziers, what wynde so euer blowe?

Whitherto ye haue hearde thre wrytours of the Breke churche, not all what they doo saye: for that were a labour to great for to gather, and to tedious for y reader: But one or two places of euery one, the which how playne, how ful, and how cleare they be against the error of transubstantiation, I referre it to the iudgement of the indifferent reader. And now I will likewise rehearse the sayenges of ether thre olde auncient wrytours of the latine church, & so make an ende.
And

And first I will begynne with
Tertullian, whom Cipriane the holy *Tertullian*
martyr so highly esteemed, that whan
so euer he wolde haue his boke, he
was wont to saye : Geue vs now the
Master. This olde wyptour in his .4.
boke agaynst Marcion the heretike, say-
eth thus: Jesus made y breadye, which
he toke, and distributed to his disciples
his body, sayeng: This is my body.
That is to saye (sayeth Tertullian) a
figure of my body. In this place it is
playne, that after Tertullianes expo-
sition, Christ ment not by calling the
breadye his body, & the wyne his blood,
that either the breadye was the natu-
rall body, or the wyne his natural
blood, but he called the his body and
blood, because he wolde institute the
to be vnto vs sacramentes : that is,
holy tokens and signes of his body
and of his blood: that by them reme-
bring and firmly beleeuing the bene-
fites procured to vs by his body
which was torne & crucified for vs,
and of his blood which was shed
for vs vpon the crosse: and so with tha-
kes receauing these holy sacraments,
according to Christes institution,
might by the same be spiritually nou-
rished

*Gard. to
the .16. ob
jection.*

typhed and fedde to the entcrease of all
godlynesse in vs here in our pilgris
mage & iournaye, wherein we walke,
vnto euerlasting lyfe. This was vn
doubtedly Christ our saueours mide,
and this is Tertullianes exposition.
The wranglyng that the Papistes
doo make to elude this sayeng of Ter
tullian, is so farre out of frame, that
it euen wearieyth me to thinke on it.
Tertullian wyrteth here (saye they)
as none hath done hitherto before
him. This sayeng is toto manifest
false: for Origene, Hilarie, Ambrose,
Basil, Gregorie Nazianzene, saint
Augustine, and other olde autors, lyke
wyle doo call the sacrament, a figure
of Christes bodey. And where they
saye, that Tertullian wrote this,
whan he was in a heate of disputaci
on, with an heretike, conctyng by
all meanes to ouerthrowe his aduer
sarie. As who saye, he wolde not take
hede, what he dyd saye, and specially
what he wolde wyrite in so hyghe a
mater, so that he might haue the bet
ter hande of his aduersarie. Is this
credible to be true in any godlye wyle
man: How muche lesse thā is it wor
thy

thy to be thought or credited in a man
of so great a wytte, learning and ex-
cellence, as Tertullian is worthily
esteemed ever for to have ben?

Lyketwyle this autor in his furst
booke agaynst the same heretike Mar-
cion, wyrteth thus: God did not reiect
bread, which is his creature: for by it he
hath made a representaciō of his body.
Now I praye you, what is this to
saye, that Christ hath made a repre-
sentation (by bread) of his body, but
that Christ hade instituted and ordap-
ned bread to be a sacrament, for to re-
present vnto vs his body? Now whe-
ther the representation of one thing
by an other, requireth the corporal
presence of the thing which is so rep-
sented or no, every man that hath
vnderstanding, is hable in this point
(the mater is so cleare of it self) to be
a sufficient iudge.

The seconde doctour and wyrtour
of the latine church (whose sayenges
I prompled to set furthe) is S. Au-
gustine: of whose learning and esti-
macion I nede not to speake. For
all the church of Christ bothe hath
Ez and

Augustine

and euer hath had hym for a man
of most singular learnyng, witte, and
diligence, bothe in setting furthe the
true doctrine of Chzistes religion, &
also in the defence of the same against
heretikes. This autoz as he hath writ-
ten most pleynteously in other ma-
ters of our faith, so likewise in this
argument he hath written at large
in many of his workes, so playnly a-
gainst this error of transubstanciati-
on, y the papistes loue least to heare of
hym, of al other wrytcours: partly for
his autoritie, & partly bicause he ope-
neth the mater more fully, than any
other doth. Therfore I will rehearse
mo places of him, thā heretofore I have
done of the other. And furst, what can
be more playne, than that which he
wryteth vpon the 80. psalme, speakig
of the sacrament of the Lordes body
and blood: and rehearsing (as it were)
Chzistes wordes to his disciples, after
this maner. It is not this body, which
ye doo see, that ye shall eat, norther shall
ye drynke this blood, which the souldy-
ours, y crucifie me, shall spill or sheade.
I doo commend vnto you a mysterie,
or a sacramēt, which spiritually vnder-
standed shall geue you life.

John

Now if Chꝛist had no moe natu-
ral and corporal bodies, but that one
which they thā presently bothe hearde
& sawe, noꝛ other natural blood, but
that which was in the same body, and
the which the souldiours did after-
warde cruelly shede vpon the crosse:
and nother this body noꝛ this blood
was (by this declaracion of S. Augu-
stine) either to be eaten oꝛ dronken,
but the mysterie therof spiritually to
be vnderstanded: than I conclude (if
this sayeng and exposition of S. Au-
gustine be true) that þ mysterie which
the disciples should eate, was not the
natural body of Chꝛist, but a mysterie
of the same spiritually to be vndersta-
ded. For as S. Augustine sayeth in his
20. booke *Contra Faustum*. ca. 21. Chꝛistes
fleshe and blood was in the olde testa-
ment promysed by similitudes and sig-
nes of their sacrifices, and was exhibi-
ted in dede and in truthe vpon þ crosse,
but the same is celebrated by a sacra-
ment of remembraunce vpo þ aultare.
And in his booke *De fide ad Penum*, ca. 19.
he sayeth, that in these sacrifices, mea-
nyng of the olde lawe, it is figuratiuely
signified, what was than to be geuen:
but in this sacrifice it is evidently signi-

fied, what is already geuen (vndersta-
ding in the sacrifice vpon the aultare)
the remembraunce and thākes geuing
for the fleshe, which he offred for vs: &
for the blood which he shedde for vs
vpon the crosse: as in the same place
and evidently ther it maye appeare.

An other evident and cleare place,
wherin it appeareth, that by the sa-
cramentall bread, which Christ called
his body, he ment a figure of his bo-
dy. As vpon the .3. Psalme, wher S.
Augustine speaketh this in playne
termes. Christ did admyrre Judas
vnto the feast, in the which he commē-
ded vnto his disciples the figure of
his bodye. This was Christes last
supper before his passion, wherin he
did ordayne the sacrament of his bo-
dy, as all learned men doo agree.

S. Augustine also in his .23. epistle
to *Bonifacius* teacheth, how sacramen-
tes doo beare the names of þ̄ things
wherof they be sacramentes, both in
Baptisme, and in the Lordes table,
euen as we call euery good frydaye,
the daye of Christes passiō: and euery
Easter daye, the daye of Christes re-
surrection: whan in very dede ther
was but one daye wherin he suffred,
and but one daye wherin he rose. And

why doo we than call them so, which
are not so in dede, but bicause they are
in like tyme and course of the yeaere,
as those dayes were, wherin those
thinges wer done: Was Christ sayeth
(S. Augusti) offred any more but once?
And he offred him self. And yet in a sa-
crament or rep:esētaciō not only euery
solēne feast of Easter, but also euery
day, to y^e people he is offred: so y^e he do-
the not lye, y^e sayeth: He is euery daye
offred. For if Sacramētes hade not sō
similitudes or likenesse of those thinges,
wherof they be Sacramētes, they could
in no wise be sacramētes: & for their si-
militudes and likenesse commonly they
haue the names of the thinges, wherof
they be sacramētes. Therfore as after
a certayn maner of speche, y^e sacramēt of
Christes body is Christes body, the sa-
crament of Christes blood is Christes
blood, so likewise the Sacrament of
faith is faith.

After this maner of speche (as S.
Augustine teacheth in his questiones
Super Leuiticum, & *Cōtra Adamantinū*) it is
sayed in scripture, that. vii earcs of
corne be seuen yeaeres: seuen fyen be vii.
yeaeres, & y^e rocke was Christ: & blood is
y^e soule: the which last sayeng (sayeth

E 4 saint

Question.
57.

Cap. 13.

Contra
Maximis
num. li. ca.
22.

S. Augustine in his booke *Contra Adip-
mantinum*) is vnderstanded to be spoken
in a signe or figure. For the Lord himself
did not sticke to saye, This is my body,
whan he gaue the signe of his body.
For we must not considre in sacramen-
tes (sayeth S. Augustine in an other
place) What they be, but what they
doo signifie: for they be signes of thin-
ges, being one thing in them selues,
and yet signifieng an other thing. For
the heauenly bread (sayeth he, speaking
of the sacramental bread) by some ma-
ner of speache is called Christes body,
whan in very dede it is the Sacrament
of his body. &c.

What can be more playne, or more
clearly spoken, than are these places
of S. Augustine before rehearsed, if
men were not obstinately bent to
mayntene an vntruthe, & to receaue
nothing what so euer dothe set it fur-
ther: yet one place more of S. Augus-
tine will I allege, which is very clea-
re to this purpose, that Christes na-
tural body is in heauen, and not here
corporally in the Sacrament, and so
let him departe. In his .50. treatise,
which he wryteth vpon Iohn, he tea-
cheth playnly and clearly, how Christ
being

being bothe God and man, is bothe
here after a certayn maner, and yet in
heaven and not here in his natural
body and substaunce, which he toke
of the blessed virgin Mary: speaking
thus of Christ and sayeng. By his di-
uine Maiestie, by his providence, and
by his unspeakeable & inuisible grace,
this is fulfilled which he spake: Beholde
I am with you vnto the ende of the
worlde. But as concernyng his fleshe
which he toke in his incarnation, as
touching that which was borne of the
virgine, as concernyng that which was
apprehended by the Jewes & crucified
vpon a tree, and taken downe from the
crosse, lapped in linnen clothes, and bu-
ryed, and rose agayn, and appeared
after his resurrection, as concernyng
that fleshe, he sayed: ye shall not euer
haue me with you. Why so? for as co-
cernyng his fleshe, he was conuersant
with his disciples .xl. Dayes, and they
accompanyeng, seing, and not folowig
hym, he wēt vp in to heaven, & is not
here. By this presēce of his diuine maies-
tie he did not departe: as concernyng this
presēce of his diuine maiestie, we haue
Christ euer wth vs: but as concernyng this
presence of his fleshe, he sayed truly to

his disciples: Ye shall not ever haue me
with you. for as cōcernyng the p̄sence
of his fleshe, the churche hade hym but
a fewe dayes: now it holdeth hym by
faith, though it see hym not.

Thus muche S. Augustine speaketh
repeating one thing so often: and al to
declare and teache, how we should vnder-
stande the maner of Christes be-
ing here with vs: which is by his gra-
ce, by his prouidence, & by his diuine
nature: and how he is absent by his
natural body which was borne of the
virgin Mary, died, and roose for vs, &
is ascended in to heauen, and ther sit-
teth (as is in the articles of our faith)
on the right hande of God, & thence (&
from non other place sayeth S. Augu-
stine) he shall com on the later daye, to
iudge & quyte & the dead. At & which
daye the righteous shall than liste vp
their heades, and the light of Goddes
truthe shall so shyne, that falshead
and errours shall be put in to perpetu-
al confusion: righteousnesse shall haue
the vpper hande, and truthe that daye
shall beare awaye & victorie, al thene-
mies therof quyte ouerthrowne, to
be troden vnder foote for euer more.
O Lorde, Lorde, I beseeche the hasten
this

this daye, than shalt thou be glorified
with the glorie due vnto thy holy
name, and vnto thy diuine maiestie:
and we shal syng vnto thee, in al ioye,
and felicitie, laude and praise for euer
more. Amen.

Here now wold I make an ende.
For me thinkes, S. Augustine is in
this mater so full and playne, and of
that autoritie, that it should not nedde
after this his declaracion, being so fir-
mely grounded vpon Goddes worde,
and so well agreing with the other
auncient autors, to bring in for the co-
firmacion of this mater any moo:
and yet I sayed, I wolde allege thre
of the latin church, to testifie the
truthe in this cause. Now therfore y
last of all shalbe *Gelasius*, which was a
bishop of Rome, but one that was bi-
shop of that sea, before y wicked vsur-
pacion and tyrannye therof spreadde &
burst out abrode in to all the worlde.
For this man was before *Bonifacius*,
yea and *Gregorie* the furst: in whole
dayes bothe corruption of doctrine
and tyrannical vsurpacion did chiefly
growe, and hade the upper hande.

Gelasius in an epistle of the twoo na-
tures of Christ, *Contra Euenichm*, writeth
thus

Gelasius

thus: The sacramentes of the body and blood of Christ, which we receaue are godly thinges, wherby and by the same we are made partakers of the diuine nature, and yet neuerthelesse the substance or nature of the bread & wyne dothe not departe nor go awaye.

Note these wordes I beseeche you, and consiore, whether any thing can be moze playnly spoken, than these wordes be agaynst the error of transubstanciacion, which is the groude and bitter roote, wherupon spring all the horrible errors befoze rehearsed.

Wherfoze seing that y falshead dothe appeare so manifestly, and by so many wayes so playnly, so clearye and so fully, that no mā nedeth to be deceaied, but he that will not see, or will not vnderstande: Let vs all that doo loue the truthe, embrace it, & forsake the falsehead. For he that loneth the truthe, is of God: and the lacke of the loue therof is the cause why God suffereth men to fall in to errors, and to perishe therein: yea and as S. Paule sayeth, why he sedeth vnto them illusions, y they beleue lies, vnto their owne condemnation: because (sayeth he)

he)they loued not the truthe . This
truthe no doubt is Goddes worde.
For Christ hym selfe sayeth vnto his
father: Thy worde is truthe. The 10.17.
loue and light wherof almighty
the God our heauenly father
geue vs , & lyghten it in
our heartes by his ho
ly spirite, throug
Jesus Christ our
Lorde. Amen.

Vincit Veritas.